

CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Vol. LXVIII

PITTSBURGH, PA., JANUARY 1934

No. 1

"O DAY OF REST AND GLADNESS"

By CLARENCE EDWARD McCARTNEY, D. D.
Pastor First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

*"When will the new moon be gone; that we may sell corn? and the Sabbath that we may set forth wheat."—Amos 8:5.
"And call the Sabbath a delight."—Isaiah 58:13.*

HERE are two attitudes of mind towards the day of rest and worship. The avaricious landlords of the time of Amos begrudged the one day of rest from labor, and wanted to know impatiently when the Sabbath would be past so that they could plant wheat. The Sabbath to them was only an irksome interference with their making gain. The other attitude towards the Lord's Day is set forth in the second passage: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord." That is the object God had in giving us the Sabbath, and it is possible for everyone to make the Sabbath a delight.

In his warfare in this world, the Christian believer has three great allies, the Church, the Bible, and the Sabbath. The oldest of the three is the Sabbath, for it is coeval with the race. Without the Sabbath the Bible would soon cease to be studied or proclaimed, and without the Sabbath the Church would soon perish.

I. THE SABBATH IS A DIVINE INSTITUTION. It was made *for* man, but not *by* man. Our whole attitude towards the Sabbath, depends on what our idea of it is and whence it came. Perhaps the popular idea of the Sabbath the day of rest and worship, is that it was a day which men established, the early Christians or the ancient Jews, and set apart for religious purposes, and guarded with certain restrictions; and then the state, in turn, protected the Sabbath with civil statutes. But that is an altogether mistaken conception of the Sabbath. Neither the Church, nor the State, nor any far-seeing and wise philanthropist, or social benefactor gave the world the Sabbath; but God, our Creator. The Sabbath, as we shall see has a natural basis, and is adapted to man's physical and moral nature. But if the world had had to wait for man to dis-

cover from nature the law of a seventh day rest, humanity had never been blessed with the Sabbath. The Sabbath was made for man, but not by man; it was made by God. The divine origin of the Sabbath is referred to in the Fourth Commandment, but appears first of all at the Creation. "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them; and on the seventh day God ended the work which He had made, and He rested on the seventh day from all

His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it." God was the first Sabbath-keeper, and what is said of God at the conclusion of the work of Creation is the best example for man. Man is to work six days and rest the seventh. The Sabbath appears again, enshrined in the immutabilities of the Deca-

Dr. R. H. Martin's book "The Day", is the best manual on the Sabbath that I have ever read. It is a book which ought to be in the hands of every Christian Minister. A nation which is on the retreat, morally and spiritually, as well as industrially and economically, may disannul all civil enactments which now safeguard the Sabbath. But Christian people must still witness to Christ on the day of His resurrection, and nourish their spiritual life with the blessings of a Sabbath Day kept holy.

CLARENCE EDWARD McCARTNEY.

logue, for the Fourth Commandment requires us to keep the seventh day holy. One cannot say that this was a particularity of the Jewish Law, which now has been abrogated in the Christian dispensation, for we find it side by side with such laws as Thou shalt not kill, steal, murder, or commit adultery. These laws belong to the immutabilities of truth and justice. We can never conceive of a time when the other nine Commandments would not be binding upon mankind. The Fourth Commandment, therefore, is a part of the moral law. No revelation from God has ever repealed it. As a divine institution the Sabbath, then, is to be honored and observed by man. No Levite, or patriarch, or Puritan, or Protestant Reformer gave us the Sabbath, but Almighty God, the Creator of the universe. That is the first reason why Christians should observe it. This was the reason recognized by Lincoln in his War Order requiring that labor in the army and navy be reduced to the measure of strict necessity, for, he said "A due regard for the divine will will demand that Sunday labor in the army and navy be reduced to the measure of strict necessity."

II. THE SABBATH ORDAINED BY GOD, BUT FOR MAN, FOR MAN'S WHOLE BEING, HIS BODY AND HIS SOUL. How true it is that the Sabbath was made for man, for man's benefit. Man's body requires it. Even inanimate matter seems to be subject to the law of the Sabbath. In one of the steel mills of Pittsburgh, small bells were being manufactured out of ingots of fine steel which had been run through the rolls many times. The process was then quickly completed. But when the bells were tested they gave forth no sound. The expert who was called in said that the running of the steel through the presses had caused intense activity of the molecules of steel without giving these molecules time to rest. It was this which rendered the bells dull and metallic. The steel was given a chance to rest, and then the product was perfect.*

Certainly this is true of man's body. Man is a seven-day machine, designed so by the great Artificer. The greatest blessing ever conferred upon man as a toiler and a laborer is the Sabbath. Henry George said, "Moses was the first labor reformer, and the Sabbath was his chief labor reform." John Bright, speaking to the toiling miners of Lancashire, used to quote the lines of George Herbert:

*"Without Thy light, the week were dark,
Thy torch doth show the way."*

America needs the rest of the Sabbath, probably more than any other nation, because of the rush and strain of our life. Statistics show that, although the average length of life in the first quarter of this century has been increased by about ten years, this is due to the great decrease in infant mortality and young people; whereas, there has been an actual increase in the deaths of middle aged people. At the head of the list of diseases which cause mortality among people over forty years of age is heart disease, responsible for one-sixth of all the deaths of people above forty years of age. This is a very significant fact. The Sabbath was made for man, and the violation of it exacts its toll of disease and death.

The Sabbath was made for man, but not for man as an animal only, as a body, but for man with his mind and his spirit. How much better is a man than a sheep! As constant, unremitting toil injures the body, so constant application to the seen and the material stunts the growth of the soul. God's laws were not given in vain. He knows what man needs. In

one of his papers in "The Spectator," Addison says that "if keeping the seventh day were only a human institution it would be the best method that could have been thought of for the polishing and civilizing of mankind." Because the Sabbath is so important and vital and central in the divine plan for mankind, the severest penalties were pronounced upon those who violated this law, for they were injuring not only themselves but mankind. The Sabbath is the glorious mainspring of the moral government of God.

III. WHAT AMERICA OWES TO THE SABBATH. It is a strange thing to see Christian people lend themselves to the program of non-Christians and aliens in our country who endeavor to heap opprobrium on the Sabbath laws and upon the godly makers of America who gave them to us. For myself, I will never have a part in that ungrateful and despicable business. The Pilgrim Fathers, according to the old hymn, left England, first for Holland, and then for America, for "freedom to worship God." But freedom to have a day of rest and worship was one of the chief motives of their migration. King James had decreed that Sunday was a day for sports, and issued his Sports Book. The Pilgrim Fathers desired to build up their families, and their civilization upon another basis. Hence they came to America. From the very beginning, in all the Colonies, the Sabbath was a part of the law of the colonies, the Sabbath was a part of the law of the land. There is no doubt either that their observance of this day made a mighty contribution to the moral stamina and spiritual well-being of the nation, as well as to its material and economic prosperity. The Sabbath gave the people a chance to know the Bible, the Fountain whence have flowed the noblest streams of influence in the religion, education and politics of the nation.

Today, under the guise of being the champions of freedom and liberty, and the enemies of bigotry, the selfish business interests are everywhere attacking such laws as now guard the Sabbath Day in the forty-two states of the Union, for there are still forty-two states with Sabbath laws, and just six with no laws protecting the Sabbath. They have been aided in their campaign by a disregard for the day on the part of the rest of the population, the Christian portion as well. More and more Sunday has become a day in which real estate is viewed, automobiles exhibited, and social entertainments held. The newspapers of the country have had an unenviable prominence in the campaign against the day which is man's best friend.

IV. THE CHRISTIAN AND THE SABBATH. Whatever the changes as to the civil enactments which safeguard the Sabbath, the Christian people of their own volition must observe the day for their spiritual welfare and for the sake of the Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. And how shall the Christian observe this day? How shall he make the Sabbath a delight? The best authority and the best example here is the Lord of the Sabbath Himself. What did Christ do on the Sabbath? In the first place, He went to Church. He commenced His public ministry in the synagogue at Nazareth on the Sabbath Day. "As His custom was," says St. Luke, He went into the synagogue on the Sabbath Day." Jesus set the Sabbath free from the absurd and tyrannical enactments by which the Pharisees turned the Sabbath into a curse instead of a blessing. But never by example or by precept did He ever intimate that the Sabbath as an institution had passed, or that it was no longer to be honored among men. If we had the record of Christ's ministry, with an account of what He did every Sabbath, there is not the slightest doubt that the record would show that Jesus went to Church every Sabbath. His pew at the Church was never empty.

On the Sabbath, too, our Lord had social intercourse with His friends. He accepted the invitation of a Pharisee to dine at his house on the Sabbath. But he made use of the occasion for the loftiest conversation and spiritual teaching. On the Sabbath, too, our Lord worked a number of His great miracles, healing the sick, and thus destroying the absurd contention of the Pharisees that it was unlawful to do good on the Sabbath Day. The rest of the day and the cessation from the routine labors of life give the Christian the opportunity for doing good, for visiting the sick, and for teaching His Word. If we were to make Christ our Example in the use of the day of rest and worship, we should all discover that the Sabbath was a delight to our souls.

The judgments and the blessings of God still stand. God still promises to bless and honor those who honor His day. The most valuable windows in the world are said to be the windows of the great Marshall Field Company in Chicago. Like the store next to our Church, the curtains come down on Saturday night and stay down until Monday morning. In a full page advertisement in the Chicago-Tribune Marshall Field and Company, inserted the following statement:

*The Day, Martin, R. H.

THE THINGS UNSEEN

"At the end of their first week in business the owners of a little shop lowered the curtains of their windows and went home.

On each succeeding Saturday night the curtains were pulled down and kept down until Monday morning.

As the little shop grew the suggestion came from many sources that the curtains should stay up. 'The windows are beautiful,' people said, 'let us walk by and look.'

The owners had an old-fashioned back-ground. They had been taught in childhood that six days are enough for the things that are seen. The first day of the week, they said, is for the things unseen—rest and worship, and family life, and freedom from thoughts of business.

Seventy-five years have passed. The store has grown until its windows are said to be more valuable than any windows in the world. But the example of the founders remains, and all Sunday the shades are down.

Is this old-fashioned custom good, in days when so many old-fashioned customs are being crowded out? We like to think so. We like the idea that on the first day of the week the Church and the home should come first.

Strong churches and strong homes build strong cities. All the great words of business—service and courtesy and kindness and truth—have their inspiration in religion. And prosperity is only permanent where there is reverence, and mutual trust, and faith."*

No political party, no National Recovery Act, no elaborate and costly system of education can give America what it most of all needs. America needs God. One of the best ways to find God is to worship Him and seek Him on His holy day. The soul of man beholds constantly the things of this world. It will do him good, if on one day of the week he pull down the blinds on the things visible and material and look for a little at the things which are unseen and eternal.

*Since this sermon was preached the manager of this store wrote me that the shades are no longer down on Sundays.

The Church of God, the Book of God, and the Day of God are a sacred trinity on earth, the chief pillars of Christian and national prosperity. Without them Europe and America would soon relapse into heathenism and barbarism.—*Philip Schaff.*

Morality in Air Advertising

Wm. Parsons, D.D.

RADIO advertising is raising in a more insistent manner, the question of the right of advertisers to thrust before the public, the solicitation to purchase or use any article that is generally deemed injurious to the individual, or to the public welfare, or if the article itself be unobjectionable, in such a manner as to offend the sensibilities, or disturb the peace of individuals.

The right of the civil government to regulate or prohibit such advertising is accepted in many forms. The crying of wares, is classed among prohibited noises. Solicitation by cab drivers is forbidden as disturbing the peace. Lottery advertisements are forbidden in any form. Fraudulent transactions of all kinds, are forbidden the use of advertising media. Vice is ruled out in every line.

The radio is raising two questions. First, should the consumption of liquor and tobacco be classed with the use of cocaine and opium and so ruled out. Second, whether in the case of unobjectionable commodities such as tooth paste, cosmetics and soap the advertisers who offend against good taste should be restrained.

The Kansas City Star recently said editorially:

"The air is public property and when the government permits its use by commercial interests that abuse the privilege the people have a right to protest. What the public would welcome in radio advertising would be such as is brief, to the point, conservative in its claims and always in good taste."

The right of the public to protest against the use of public property in a way that tends to injure public welfare or offends good taste needs emphasis today. This is true not only in the use of the air but in the use of the highways, the mails, and the express services.

A large proportion of the people regard, for scientific, moral and religious reasons, the habitual use of narcotics, whether nicotine or alcohol as essentially vicious. According to the principle set forth by the Kansas City Star they have a right to protest against any use of public property that tends to the promotion of the use of these commodities. The crying of these wares certainly is for that purpose and tends to do it. If they are justified in their protest the government is under obligation to protect them against such offense.

But here the greed of the advertising mediums joins forces with the

cupidity of the commercial interests which are involved in their manufacture and sale, to over ride the rights of the public in these matters. The Washington Dispatches for Jan. 9 carry the following instance of the right which is just beginning under the Twenty-first Amendment. "Removal of legal restrictions against mailing into dry territory publications displaying liquor advertising will be sought by Senator Clark."

These restrictions were imposed by the Reed Act which also prohibits the interstate shipment of liquor consigned to dry states.

The Clark bill which will be offered as an amendment to the House tax bill will not alter the liquor shipment provision of the Reed bill except to rewrite the penalties. Senator Clark's comment on it was that "the restrictions upon mailing publications from wet to dry territory merely works a hardship on the publisher."

Of course, but the people are more interested in protecting the youth from the influence of these advertisements than in promoting the publisher's income. But the same argument is heard concerning liquor and tobacco advertisements on the radio. The convictions of the Christian element of the people, the protection of youth, the provisions of the Constitution or statutory law should all give place, in the estimation of the interests involved, to the profits of the newspapers, the broadcasting companies and the advertising agencies. Against this we emphatically protest.

Against advertising which offends merely against good taste we can close our eyes or turn the switch and draw our purse strings. But in the case of the children in the home, whose judgment is not yet mature enough to tell them when to close their eyes and ears and who have no purse strings to pull, their only adequate protection is for the government to rule such unethical and offensive advertisements from any use of the public property or service. Above all where the Twenty-first Amendment prohibits the sale of liquor it is the height of venal inconsistency and delinquency on the part of the government to encourage the speakeasy and the bootlegger by permitting the advertising of such wares. If the broadcasters, the metropolitan dailies, the magazines and the moving picture advertisers cannot adapt themselves to the constitution and the law let them cut out the advertisements.

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Founded in 1867

Devoted to Christian Political and Social
Science

Official Organ of

THE NATIONAL REFORM ASS'N

An organization of Christian citizens founded in 1863

Published Monthly, except July and August,
at the Association's Headquarters,

209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh, Pa.

R. H. MARTIN, Editor-in-Chief

WM. PARSONS, Associate Editor

Rates, \$1.00 the year, payable in advance.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 30,
1906 at Pittsburgh, Pa., under Act of Con-
gress of March 3, 1879.Dr. McCartney and the
Sabbath

We are glad to have appear on the front page of The Christian Statesman a reproduction of a sermon on the Christian Sabbath by Clarence Edward Macartney, D.D., delivered on the morning of November 3, 1933.

We want a message of this kind to be distributed as far and as wide as possible, not alone because it is a good sermon, as good sermons go, but because it refers to a matter neglected by the nation.

Outstanding in the sermon are its simplicity and substantialness. Here we have a minister not only preaching to the individuals of his congregation but calling out a great truth to the nation as a whole, pointing to the importance of the Christian Sabbath.

Dr. Macartney, pastor of one of the most important churches in America, shows himself here a prophet preaching the substantial goodness of God.

The Butcher, The Baker,
The Candlestick Maker
and "THE DAY"

Indeed this is truly the title for any discussion of "The Day" today because we are hearing from lawyers, judges, ministers, Sabbath school workers, and innumerable laymen constantly with almost monotonous regularity, praising "The Day".

What we are more interested in is this—they are putting "The Day" to work. In the First Presbyterian Church of Beaver Falls, Pa., the Men's Bible Class set aside five consecutive Sabbaths to discuss "The Day" as their lesson material. The teacher and members of the class have all expressed fine appreciation of what they got out of that lesson period. Others are doing likewise. Several prominent ministers have

preached sermons on the Sabbath, inspired by "The Day". We are indebted to Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney, for his reference to "The Day" in his sermon. The presentation of "The Day" to the student bodies of the seminaries of Pittsburgh, reported elsewhere in this issue, is being done with the expressed purpose of having the students develop sermons on the Sabbath.

Plans are being completed to develop a seminar to be conducted for five consecutive nights on the Sabbath, using "The Day" as a background. This seminar will be led by Dr. Martin and will be available to cities, towns and counties for a modest cost. It will be a combination of Bible study and religious leadership, designed to train our Church membership to intelligently resist the onslaught against the Christian Sabbath being pushed so vigorously even now by its enemies.

The splendid circulation of "The Day" has been most gratifying to the Association and to the author. It has now penetrated underneath the maple leaf of Canada—the palm tree of Florida—you will find it in California—in the North and South Atlantic States, and in the middle West.

Here is a constructive opportunity to do great work for the cause. If you have a friend who is a Sabbath school teacher, a minister, or religious student, tell them about "The Day", or present them with a copy of it. The efficient fabroid flexible cover copy is available for \$1.00 and the more sedate cloth bound volume, suitable for study or library, is \$1.50. Quotations will be made on large quantities should you be interested in distributing, say, a copy to each minister in your town, city, or county. Write the National Reform Association, 209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh, Pa.

The Liquor Problem—
Alcohol!

Since the repeal of the 18th Amendment in all the discussions and controversies in the public press, in Congress and in legislative halls, over the question of how best to deal with the traffic in intoxicating liquors, the central factor in the whole problem seems to be entirely ignored. The questions discussed and fought over are such as these: Shall the State go into the liquor business and sell the liquor to its citizens or shall it license private individuals to sell it; shall the liquor be drunk on the premises where sold or shall the purchaser be required to leave the place of sale and go out on the street, into a hotel,

his home, club, or automobile before drinking it? If permitted to drink it at the place of sale shall he drink it at the bar where sold standing up, or shall he be required to go to a table and sit down before drinking it, perchance to lie under the table and drink it?

All such questions as these are on the periphery of the problem, and far away from its center. After all, the entire liquor problem centers in one thing and only one . . . *alcohol*. It is the alcohol in every form of intoxicating liquors and its effects, which drinkers want and which lead them to drink. It is the alcohol in these liquors, the alcohol which is a narcotic poison and a habit forming drug, which does the damage and which creates the manifold problems which grow out of the liquor business—the poverty, the crime, the physical impairment and disease, the political, social and economic problems that result from it. Eliminate alcohol from intoxicating beverages, and you will have eliminated that which produces all these problems. Eliminate alcohol and the age-old controversy over intoxicating liquors will collapse over night. But as long as beverage alcohol remains we have not touched the source, the root of all the evils connected with the traffic. Alcohol is the primal cause of them all. What matters it whether the person who purchases intoxicating liquors containing this poison alcohol drinks it standing up, sitting down, lying on his back, or on his front; whether he drinks it at the place of purchase or in his home; whether he gets it from an agent of the Government of his State and drinks it publicly, or whether he buys it from a bootlegger and drinks it in some dingy room with the doors locked? The alcohol in liquor when it goes down his throat and gets into his blood has the same injurious effects on him. We do not say that the place and the conditions under which alcoholic liquors are consumed have no bearing on the liquor problem. It may, and doubtless will, have some effect upon the amount and frequency with which the intoxicating beverages are consumed, but all such efforts to solve the problem that ignore the central basic fact that alcohol is the culprit, the scoundrel, the renegade, the criminal that causes all the trouble, are destined to fail.

Those who are responsible for the repudiation of national prohibition, as well as the "drys", must now face this basic fact and build a program of education and legislation based upon it. If we would solve the liquor problem we must put alcohol in the center of the stage. We must focus the

spot light on it. We must get across to the people, and especially to the youth of America, in a way that will imbed into their consciousness and conscience the truth that alcohol is a narcotic poison, a habit-forming drug. If we will do this there is no doubt that America will ultimately solve the liquor problem.

Legal Alcohol versus Bootleg Liquor

From reading most of the newspaper discussion over the liquor question these days, and from a study of the discussion of this subject in legislative halls, one might well draw the conclusion that the chief evil of the liquor business centers in bootleggers and in the poisonous bootleg liquor. If we can only eliminate the bootlegger and his poisonous bootleg liquor we have, to all intents and purposes, solved the liquor problem.

We are personally opposed to bootleggers and to bootleg liquors. We will do everything within our power to uproot and destroy both, but if it were possible to accomplish this (which it is not) with the legal liquor traffic still remaining, we would not have gotten far, if indeed made any progress, toward the solution of the liquor problem. As we have said before, it is the poison in the liquor, the alcohol, the narcotic poison, the habit-forming drug which produces all the problems that grow out of the liquor business.

Suppose it can be proved that legal liquors are just as poisonous and injurious as the liquors made and sold by bootleggers what would those who are now setting up the various legal systems of regulation and control of the liquor traffic, and who are exhausting their brain power in one mighty effort to stamp out bootleggers and poisonous bootleg liquor, say to this?

According to the best scientific and medical authorities who have made careful investigation and study of this subject, this is the actual fact that, on the whole, the legal so called "good" liquor is fully as poisonous, if not more so, than the "poisonous" bootleg liquor.

This is what they say: The bootleg liquor does contain poisons not found in the "good" legal liquor but these poisons are present in such very small quantities in comparison with the alcohol in the bootleg liquors that they do not do the drinker much harm, that it is the alcohol in bootleg liquors which usually cause death in those who died from drinking these liquors; that it is the ethyl or plain alcohol both in the legal good

liquor and in the bootleg liquor that is the poison which does the damage.

We cite as our authority the book "Alcohol and Man" edited by Haven Emerson, M.D., of Columbia University. Its chapters were written by outstanding scientific and medical authorities of the United States and Great Britain. These men wrote not from a prohibition or anti-prohibition point of view but as scientists. Several writers in this book, after making an investigation and study of this subject, came to the conclusion stated above.

After speaking of the various poisons contained in the bootleg liquors Emil Bogen, Ph.D., Pathologist Olive View Sanatorium, California, says: "Although it is true that these (denaturants) are deadly poisons when taken in adequate doses yet at the concentration in which they exist in most denatured alcohols death is much more likely to be caused by the ethyl alcohol itself than by the denatured drug that accompanies it."

The same conclusion is reached by Harrison S. Martland, M.D., Pathologist of Newark City Hospital, and Chief Medical Examiner of Essex County, N. J., who says "Most 'bootleg' liquor is diluted with water and to this extent is less toxic than full strength genuine liquors"

"In conclusion it may be stated almost any known poison may gain entrance into bootleg liquor but in such insignificant amounts in comparison with ethyl alcohol present that they can be ignored in almost all instances."

In the light of these conclusions it is evident we can never solve the liquor problem by stamping out the bootleg trade alone. To solve the problem we must stamp out the liquor traffic in alcohol as well. Let "wets" and "drys" alike face this fact.

"Disloyal Citizens"

Citizens of Pennsylvania! Are you aware of the fact that unless you purchase liquor from the Pennsylvania liquor stores you are a disloyal citizen of the State, according to a statement issued by the Pennsylvania Liquor Board in the name of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Speaking of these State-operated liquor stores, the Liquor Board says "Every loyal citizen, by patronage and co-operation, will assist in their success." Patronage can have no other meaning than that of purchasing intoxicating liquor from these stores with the intent, of course, of drinking it. This you must do, says the Liquor Control Board, and it speaks in the name of

the Commonwealth, if you are to be a loyal citizen of the State.

To remove any doubt as to the proper meaning of this declaration we give the entire paragraph of which it is the concluding sentence. Here it is, as found at the heading of a document giving the various liquors to be obtained in these stores and the prices at which they can be purchased, and as published in newspapers throughout the State:

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board

Beginning January 2nd, 1934, and continuing as rapidly as alterations can be completed, 240 liquor stores will be opened in Pennsylvania at convenient places to serve the public. These are your stores. They are operated by your State government. Profits from their operation are paid into your State Treasury to meet appropriations for relief and pensions to the blind and the aged. Every Pennsylvanian may feel justly proud of the principles back of these State-operated stores. Every loyal citizen, by patronage and co-operation, will assist in their success.

In the olden days when intoxicating liquors were obtained at privately owned saloons, the saloon keeper resorted to various and questionable means to increase the sale of his liquors and thereby add to his own profits, but never did any liquor dealer go to the length of asserting that unless the people purchased liquors at his saloon they were disloyal citizens of the Commonwealth which licensed him to sell liquors. But now that the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has gone into the liquor business and became the big saloon keeper of the State in the effort to secure patronage of the State's liquor stores and increase the State's profit from the business, the Liquor Board of the State makes the purchase of liquors from these stores a condition of loyal citizenship. Never was a greater insult offered to the sober non-drinking citizens of Pennsylvania. It is our belief that the great majority of the citizens of the State have not, and will not, patronize these liquor stores any more than they will patronize bootleggers. If this be true then a big majority of Pennsylvania citizens cannot qualify under this declaration as loyal citizens. Governor Pinchot has not been a drinking man. It is our firm conviction that he is not today—that he has not purchased any liquor from any of these State-operated stores and will not do so in the future. Does the Liquor Board therefore regard the Governor of the State as a dis-

(Continued on page 8)

Association Activities

THE President of the National Reform Association attended the National Conference of Organizations Supporting the Eighteenth Amendment in Washington, D. C., on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th of January, 1934. The outstanding event of the Conference was the union of the National Temperance Council and the Conference of Organizations Supporting the Eighteenth Amendment. The consolidated organizations, now known as The National Temperance and Prohibition Council, elected the following officers:

President, Prof. Milton Canover, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Vice Presidents, Ida B. Wise Smith, Des Moines, Iowa, Colonel P. H. Callahan, Louisville, Ky., Edwin C. Dinwiddie, Washington, D. C.; Secretary, Mr. E. B. Dunford, Washington, D. C.; Treasurer, Dr. D. Leigh Colvin, New York City.

While in Washington Dr. Martin visited with religious leaders, conferring about the Sabbath and temperance program of the future. An expected trip to Richmond, Va., was postponed until February.

Dr. Martin will address the Hershey Industrial School Sunday morning, January 28th, and the Hershey Community Theater mass meeting on the afternoon of the same day. He goes as a guest of the Hershey Estates who have been bringing outstanding religious leaders before the Industrial School and the Community each Sunday.

At the next Board meeting a complete campaign will be planned for the coming months, with special em-

phasis being placed upon anti-alcohol education and Sabbath observance. It is possible that Dr. Martin and Mr. Ralston will both take the field in a series of intensive county campaigns.

Cameron Ralston will represent the National Reform Association before the Pennsylvania Council of Churches at the Annual State Convention, Harrisburg, which he will address the morning of January 30th on "The Church's place in Social Reform". The afternoon of the same day he will lead the Conference on the same subject.

At present, Mr. Ralston has invitations from all of the State Teachers Colleges in Pennsylvania to present to them his temperance lecture. The itinerary will be set up as soon as acceptance of dates can be agreed upon.

There is much work to be done in the field and we are urging our friends to co-operate in every way in advancing Association activities. The need was never as great, nor the opportunity. The eternal problem of finance has, of course, been the greatest hazard to field activity. There are no pockets in the shroud. The grim reaper is daily at work. Here again we need to put first things first. What greater way to spend ones self and ones money than in the building of His Kingdom on Earth. It is mutually agreed that 1933 was the worst year financially the nation has ever known, but a peculiar evidence of the manifestations of God's Will is that the National Reform Association's activities were more extensive in that year, and more effective. We thank God for the privilege of doing His work.

"The Day" in Pittsburgh Seminaries

John W. Alexander's gift of a copy of "The Day", by R. H. Martin, D.D., to each student of the Reformed Presbyterian Seminary here, surely started something. The entire student bodies of the Western Theological Seminary and of Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary will also be the recipients of copies of "The Day". Dr. Martin will also lecture to student bodies of the latter seminaries February 14th and 15th.

Inspired by Mr. Alexander's original action, the Field Department suggested to a few men of means that they make it possible that these larger student bodies also receive copies of "The Day". Being men of vision

they not only made it possible that the student bodies receive "The Day" but they also supplied sufficient funds to enable Dr. Martin to lecture the student bodies on the contents of the book and its use in their future ministry.

On January 22nd Dr. Martin made an address before the Ministerial Association of Johnstown, Pa., on the necessity of creating and maintaining a stronger public sentiment for the Sabbath and our Sabbath Laws if these laws are to remain on our statute books and be enforced. Recently the Mayor of Johnstown announced that Sunday Movies would be permitted, though this is in open violation of the State law. The City Council says the State law will be enforced.

Quiet Observer's Column

REV. H. B. MANSELL

While waiting for repeal to make good the large promises of its advocates we may consider the record of prohibition. Since alcohol has been recognized as injurious to health its opponents promised that its elimination would result in an improvement in the public health. Waiving all consideration of handicaps as the presence of a large body of habitual drinkers, of the cunning propaganda to spread drinking among our young people and any thing else that hampered prohibition, what have been the results?

A most sensitive index to the well being of a people is the death rate. The average death rate of the registration area of the United States for the last seven years before the war, 1911-1917, was 1395.1 deaths per 100,000 population. For the seven prohibition years, 1926-1932, it fell to 1157.1 or a reduction of 238 deaths in every 100,000. Apply this to the whole population it means saving nearly THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND lives a year.

Now it is foolish to claim that the reduced consumption of alcoholic beverages is the sole cause of this improvement. It is just as unreasonable to deny that prohibition played an important part in this improvement. For the directly alcoholic diseases, as alcoholism and cirrhosis of the liver, and diseases indirectly affected by drinking, as tuberculosis, are among those showing the greatest improvement. And while it is true that other lands have shown a fall in their death rates, as for instance Great Britain and Sweden, their fall is proportionately less than ours. Moreover high taxation, strict regulations, and the post war depression has reduced their consumption of liquor. That is less drinking has been a factor in their improvement.

It is beyond dispute that a marked improvement in the public health of this land coincided with the prohibition years. It remains to be seen whether this country will continue such improvement under repeal.

Meanwhile it is well that Mr. Farley has returned from Europe. Mr. Secretary Morgenthau will doubtless be glad to have his fellow member of the cabinet bring in that budget-balancing liquor revenue. From Dec. 5, when the great god Bacchus undertook to balance the budget, the United States has gone behind \$308,000,000. Hurry, Mr. Farley, for another month like that and the deficit will be double the revenue from liquor for a whole year.

Church Taxation

Three New York clergymen recently came out with a statement advocating a modification of the laws which exempt church property from general taxation. Most reasonable people will agree with this appeal. It is however to be regretted that these three men did not add to the statement a clear enunciation of the principle upon which that modification should proceed and point out the definite limits where such exemptions should be allowed.

Two distinctions are necessary in any effective discussion of this matter. The first is between property held exclusively for public worship and religious education and that which is held for direct or indirect revenue production, and the second is between general taxes and service taxes.

Under the first, church buildings, purely religious education or administrative buildings and their necessary sites should be exempt, with a fair allowance for the artistic effects, and for utility adjuncts. But manses, homes for workers by whatever names they are called, schools for general education where fees are charged and all other potentially revenue producing property should be subject to general as well as special service taxes.

Under the second it has been considered wisdom on the part of government to exempt the non-revenue producing properties from the general taxation on account of the public service they render. But this should not include service taxes which are levied for service rendered by the government to the community and in which they participate. For instance the taxes which go into official salaries and other expenses of the machinery of government should be omitted as belonging to a distinct class of obligations. On the other hand assessments for constructing sewers, walks, pavements, municipally owned water and electric plants belong in an entirely different class and are for service rendered. The first may wisely be exempt because of the services which the church renders, but it is unreasonable under our system of separation of church and state to ask the state to support the church by rendering such material services gratis. It should pay for them just as it pays a private corporation, its water and light bills.

What is needed today is the clear recognition of these distinctions and their adoption. Having done that the next task is for every state to sweep away the subterfuges and eva-

sions and all unfair holdings under exemption laws.

Four illustrations of such evasions come to mind.

1. The placing of chapels in schools, hospitals, and homes which are potential revenue producers and claiming exemption for them on the ground that they are places of religious worship.

2. Connecting manses and workers homes with church buildings, whether by making them a part of the church structure or by means of permanent covered ways. In either case they should be subject to general taxes as well as special.

3. Office buildings used to house either church or denominational activities are in some states exempted. Equity would seem to lie in the direction of exempting only such parts or proportion of the buildings as are of no potential revenue value.

4. The question of adjacent land often becomes of considerable importance especially in large cities. Some adjoining land is necessary for the use of the building, such as walks, drives and parking lots. Some is necessary for architectural effect, but there should be a limit placed upon this used for architectural effect or for parking purposes. There are churches which have ten acre plots used for these purposes. Where these extend beyond absolute necessity they should be regarded as luxuries for which the churches should be willing to pay the equitable tax rates.

If the various state governments will follow this course the Protestant churches of the United States will we believe support them in it. All that most churches desire is that their work shall not be made burdensome or impossible for them to maintain houses of worship fitting the locality in which they are placed. What they object to is such taxation as is illustrated by the California laws of thirty years ago, which made it impossible for one church, in a thickly populated area where it was much needed to accept a legacy of \$200,000 left for building purposes because its estimated revenue would not enable it to pay the taxes on the proposed building and still maintain its work. They chose to continue in a cheap frame building as the only possible course.

Somewhere between this extreme and present conditions the states should find a system of taxation and exemption which will be satisfactory to all and equitable.

The Unreliability of The Literary Digest

There are some people upon whose statements we cannot rely whenever they speak on some subjects, however reliable they may be in general. The printed page often reflects this peculiarity of those who control their utterances. Many illustrations of this could be cited but just now the Literary Digest is a glaring example. It seems impossible for that paper to get things straight whenever it gets upon the subject of prohibition. Here are some specifications that substantiate this charge.

In the issue of Dec. 23, 1933, page 6 is this statement: "The bootlegger is the child of prohibition." The average man in the street may be excused for such a statement because of the prevalence of it in propaganda and his lack of facilities to get at the truth, but an editorial staff of the magnitude of that of the Literary Digest can get at the truth if it wants to do so and is under obligations to its subscribers to do so. Had they sought the truth this is what they would have found. The Raines law investigations of 30 years ago in their own home town brought out the fact that there were more illicit sellers in that city than licensed dealers. About three times as many as under prohibition. At the same time Chicago had almost as large a proportion. In Boston in 1741, according to the statement recently made by Henry Bamford Parkes "one eighth of the houses were either licensed taverns or illicit drinking and gambling resorts."

Now the Literary Digest staff could easily have gotten these and a hundred other facts that point in the exactly opposite direction to their statement, but they preferred to make the statement.

On page 4 of the same issue occurs this statement: "The repeal of prohibition has opened vast resources of revenue." The fact is that all it did was to shift the taxes from the rich corporations and the users of gasoline to the drinkers of alcoholic liquor. And compared with the sum total of the government's expenditures and resources the liquor tax is a trickle.

In the issue of Dec. 30, 1933, page 4, column 6, we find: "Prohibition has been repealed and at the end of the first month the nation has not been debauched." Yet here are the facts. The statistics of arrest for drunkenness, accidents attributed to intoxicated drivers, consumption of alcoholic liquor all show a sharp increase.

Circumventing a Constitutional Weakness

REPUDIATION of public debts is not a peculiar European dereliction. Several of the states of the United States led the way in this political delinquency by repudiating considerable quantities of their bonds. These, as is well known, are largely held by Europeans, chiefly British.

These states have taken advantage of the Eleventh Amendment that denies the jurisdiction of the Federal courts in causes between citizens of foreign nations and citizens of other states and any state of the Union. This amendment was not passed primarily to cover such defalcation but to bolster up a fanciful sovereignty. But it has proven a backward step in constitutional development just as the Twenty-first Amendment is and will prove to be in the future.

Now comes the little principality of Monaco and begins suit against the state of Mississippi for violation of the Constitution of the United States by passing a clause in its constitution that violates Art. I, Sec. 10, in that it impairs the validity of contracts.

The story back of this suit is about as follows: In 1841 Mississippi issued railroad bonds. It shortly afterwards repudiated them. In 1851 its own supreme court held them to be valid contracts. In 1875 a constitutional convention formulated and the state adopted a new constitution containing a clause repudiating these bonds. About a year ago some unnamed persons gave the state of Monaco \$100,000 worth of these bonds and this state has begun its suit. Few are the people but who will suspect that British bondholders, the heirs of those who originally bought the bonds, are using this suit as a trial balloon. Whether this will prove to be a way around that wart on our constitution known as the Eleventh Amendment remains to be seen. Looking at it through a layman's eyes it would look more promising if a citizen of Mississippi were the plaintiff in the case. But if it does nothing else at the present time except to focus our attention upon the fact that we of the United States were the modern pioneers in this repudiation business it may make for more conciliatory spirit on the part of this country in dealing with this vexatious problem.

It is to be hoped however that it may break down another illusion, namely that we have had an unbroken progress in the development of constitutional government. The fact is

that even a cursory study of this matter of the Eleventh Amendment reveals that we suffered a sorry slump in both economic and moral progress when it was adopted. And that we have slumped far more in adopting the Twenty-first amendment will become evident in time. If we make a few more such backward slips it may hasten the day when the whole document will go into the melting pot of a general constitutional convention that may consolidate, re-classify, rearrange the powers of government and eliminate some of the inconsistencies that amendments have brought into this document.

This probably is the only way that we shall ever secure a Christian recognition of the true source of civil authority, a permanent standard of civil, inalienable, and natural rights for unpopular minorities, the exclusion of aliens from the count for congressional representation, the abolition of child labor, federal, (and consequently uniform) marriage and divorce laws, uniform laws governing contracts, equitable distribution of taxes between the several units of government, the repeal of the Eleventh Amendment, the development of the principle of the regulation or suppression of any industry for the public welfare, the elimination of the weaknesses of the jury system, the adequate development of the Federal courts, the making clear the distinction between the establishment of a church or religion by law and the employment of religious truth and literature in public education, the establishment of the state's right to be religious in its own person without any mediation of any church, the definition of the citizen's right to possess and bear arms and the prohibition of the private manufacture and traffic in military arms and munitions and probably several other provisions that the experimentations of the new deal will reveal as necessary for further progress. For we have not come to the end of the road of constitutional development, but we have become stalled on this road which has been bogged by predatory interests, undigested alienism, and antiquated provincialism.

But let us sincerely hope and fervently pray that this highly desirable event does not come upon us in a period when we are suffering from the moral, intellectual, economic and social slump which is the aftermath of a great war. That might destroy the worth of a constitution entirely. For in such a time as we are now ex-

periencing no constitution, that was worthy of the effort it takes to fabricate such an instrument of government, would have even a ghost of a chance of adoption. Anything that could now be adopted would as surely wreck the nation as did the Articles of Confederation.

The Enemy Among Us

Under this heading Collier's contains an editorial from which we quote the following:

"We are just rid of the Eighteenth Amendment and are now experimenting with other varieties of mistaken liquor legislation . . . The brewers and the distillers and their allies drove the Country to prohibition. Not all brewers and distillers were greedy fools. A large enough minority were, however, dishonest and wholly unscrupulous. Neither the honest brewers nor the honest distillers were able to restrain the thieves. So public indignation piled up against the Saloon and we had fourteen years of prohibition . . . Who wrecked the noble experiment? Greedy thieves. The wets did not persuade the Country to abandon the Eighteenth Amendment. Dishonest politicians and enforcement agents disgusted the American public, and so we are trying another experiment.

Greed and dishonesty can wreck the new experiment. In various States dishonest politicians and unscrupulous business men are trying to extract unclean profits out of the liquor laws. Stories of funds raised to influence legislation begin to be heard. The idiots won't learn."

"Disloyal Citizens"

Continued from page 5

loyal citizen? It is bad enough for the State to go into the liquor business and dispense alcoholic poison to go down the throats of its people; it is worse for it to assert that its people may feel justly proud of the principles back of these State-operated stores—but it reaches the height of absurdity and insolence when it declares that to be a loyal citizen you must patronize these stores.

The Liquor Control Board should be made to withdraw this statement and apologize for making it. We call upon the "disloyal citizens" who do not patronize these stores as individuals and groups to register a protest with Governor Pinchot and the Liquor Control Board at Harrisburg and to insist upon a withdrawal of, and apology for, this statement.